

Attorney Docket: 00343
U.S. Application No. 09/749,826 Art Unit 2631
Response to September 19, 2007 Office Action

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated February 21, 2008, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4-7, 17-20, and 23-34 are pending in this application. Claims 2-3, 8-16, 21-22, and 35-52 have been, or were previously, canceled with prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims 1-3 & 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

The Office rejected claims 1-3 and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,889,385 to Rakib, *et al.* in view of U.S. Patent 6,732,366 to Russo.

First, claim 3 has been canceled, so the rejection of this claim is moot.

Second, claims 1-2 and 5-7 cannot be obvious over *Rakib* and *Russo*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by the proposed combination of *Rakib* and *Russo*. Independent claim 1 recites architectural features that are not taught or suggested by *Rakib* and *Russo*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites "*a plurality of buses comprising a media bus, a network bus, and a system data bus*," with "*the system data bus connected to the media bus and configured to only receive the deciphered information signals from the media bus, the system data bus unable to send information to the media bus*." Support for such features may be found at least at page 23 and FIG. 6 of the as-filed application. Independent claim 1 also recites "*wherein the deciphered information signals communicate from the media bus, to the system data bus, and to the network bus for routing by the data switch*," "*wherein the video overlay signals communicate from the video overlay processor, to the system data bus, and to the network bus for routing by the data switch*," and "*wherein data switch information from the data switch communicates from the network bus to the system data bus, but the data switch information is prevented from communicating to the media bus*." Support for

Attorney Docket: 00343
U.S. Application No. 09/749,826 Art Unit 2631
Response to September 19, 2007 Office Action

such features may be found at least at page 23 and FIG. 6 of the as-filed application. Independent claim 1 is reproduced below.

1. A system for multimedia on demand, the system comprising:

a plurality of buses comprising a media bus, a network bus, and a system data bus;

a plurality of tuners and demodulators connected to the system data bus and connected to an analog-to-digital converter, the plurality of tuners and demodulators sending an analog information signal to the analog-to-digital converter, and the analog-to-digital converter outputting digital information signal based at least in part on the analog information signal;

the plurality of tuners and demodulators also connected to a decryption circuit that decrypts an encrypted information signal received from the plurality of tuners and demodulators and produces a decrypted information signal;

a decoder circuit connected to the decryption circuit that converts the decrypted information signal from one format to a second format;

a cipher/decipher circuit connected to the decoder circuit and connected to the analog-to-digital converter that deciphers the digital information from the analog-to-digital converter and deciphers the converted decrypted information signal from the decoder circuit;

the cipher/decipher circuit connected to the media bus and sending deciphered information signals to the media bus;

the system data bus connected to the media bus and configured to only receive the deciphered information signals from the media bus, the system data bus unable to send information to the media bus;

a video overlay processor connected between the system data bus and the media bus, the video overlay processor receiving the deciphered information signals from the media bus and sending video overlay signals to the system data bus;

the network bus connected to the system data bus and receiving system data bus information and the video overlay signals communicated along the system data bus;

a mass storage device connected to the system data bus and storing the system data bus information and the video overlay signals;

a data switch connected to the network bus, the data switch receiving the system data bus information and the video overlay signals and sending the system data bus information and the video overlay signals to one or more switch ports;

Attorney Docket: 00343
U.S. Application No. 09/749,826 Art Unit 2631
Response to September 19, 2007 Office Action

a processor connected to the system data bus; and
memory coupled to the system data bus,

wherein the deciphered information signals communicate from the media bus, to
the system data bus, and to the network bus for routing by the data switch,

wherein the video overlay signals communicate from the video overlay processor,
to the system data bus, and to the network bus for routing by the data switch, and

wherein data switch information from the data switch communicates from the
network bus to the system data bus, but the data switch information is prevented from
communicating to the media bus.

The combined teaching of *Rakib* with *Russo* does not teach or suggest all these architectural features. As both *Rakib* and *Russo* has been previously cited and thoroughly discussed in the record, no further detailed explanation of either document is needed. Because the proposed combination of *Rakib* and *Russo* is silent to all these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that claims 1-2 and 5-7 are obvious. These claims, then, cannot be obvious over *Rakib* and *Russo*, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of claims 1-2 and 5-7.

Rejection of Claims 17-19 & 25-33

The Office rejected claims 17-19 and 25-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib* and *Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,790,176 to *Craig*.

Again, though, claims 17-19 and 25-33 are not obvious over *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig*. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not taught or suggested by the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig*. Both independent claims 17 and 26, for example, recite similar features as discussed above with reference to independent claim 1. As the above paragraphs explained, *Rakib* and *Russo* do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claims 17 and 26, and *Craig* does not cure these deficiencies. *Craig*, too, has been previously discussed in the record and need not be further explained. The combined teaching of *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig* fails to teach or suggest “*the system data bus connected to the media bus and*

Attorney Docket: 00343
U.S. Application No. 09/749,826 Art Unit 2631
Response to September 19, 2007 Office Action

*configured to only receive the deciphered information signals from the media bus, the system data bus unable to send information to the media bus.” Independent claim 17 also recites “wherein the deciphered information signals communicate from the media bus, to the system data bus, and to the network bus for routing by the data switch,” “wherein the video overlay signals communicate from the video overlay processor, to the system data bus, and to the network bus for routing by the data switch,” and “wherein data switch information from the data switch communicates from the network bus to the system data bus, but the data switch information is prevented from communicating to the media bus.” Independent claim 26 recites similar features. Because *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig* are all silent to at least these features, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that claims 17-19 and 25-33 are obvious. These claims, then, cannot be obvious over *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig*, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of claims 17-19 and 25-33.*

Rejection of Claim 4

The Office rejected claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib* and *Russo* and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0118954 to *Barton, et al.* *Barton* has been previously discussed in the record and need not be further explained.

Claim 4, though, is not obvious over *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Barton*. Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1 and, thus incorporates the same distinguishing features. As the above paragraphs explained, both *Rakib* and *Russo* are silent to many of independent claim 1’s features, and *Barton* does not cure these deficiencies. Because the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Barton* is silent to many of the features recited by independent claim 1, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that claim 4 is obvious. The Office is thus respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of claim 4.

Rejection of Claims 23 & 24

Attorney Docket: 00343
U.S. Application No. 09/749,826 Art Unit 2631
Response to September 19, 2007 Office Action

The Office rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig* and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,637,031 to *Chou, et al.*

Claims 23 and 24, though, are not obvious over *Rakib*, *Russo*, *Craig*, and *Chou*. Claims 23 and 24 depend from independent claim 17 and, thus incorporate the same distinguishing features. As the above paragraphs explained, *Rakib*, *Russo*, and *Craig* do not teach or suggest the architecture recited by independent claim 17, and *Chou* does not cure these deficiencies. *Chou* has been previously discussed in the record and need not be further explained. Because the proposed combination of *Rakib*, *Russo*, *Craig*, and *Chou* is silent to many of the features recited by independent claim 17, one of ordinary skill in the art would not think that claims 23 and 24 are obvious. The Office is thus respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of claims 23 and 24.

Rejection of Claims 20 & 34

The Office rejected claims 20 and 34 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib*, *Russo*, *Craig*, and *Barton*. Claims 20 and 34, however, respectively depend from independent claims 17 and 26. As the above paragraphs explained, the combined teaching of *Rakib*, *Russo*, *Craig*, and *Barton* fails to teach or suggest all the features recited by independent claims 17 and 26. One of ordinary skill in the art, then, would not think that claims 20 and 34 are obvious. The Office is thus respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of claims 20 and 34.

Rejection of Claim 36

The Office rejected independent claim 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib*, *Russo*, *Craig*, and *Chou*. Claim 36, though, has been canceled, so the rejection is moot.

Rejection of Claim 37

Attorney Docket: 00343
U.S. Application No. 09/749,826 Art Unit 2631
Response to September 19, 2007 Office Action

The Office rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Rakib*, *Russo*, *Craig*, *Chou*, and *Barton*. Claim 37, though, has been canceled, so the rejection is moot.

If any issues remain outstanding, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390